

November 18, 1991

To: Mark

Re: call-forwarding from 346-9236 to D.I.D.:
473-6410 - Great Hills Corporate Center

Our client forwarded her phones @ 5:04 pm on Tuesday 11/9. When she returned to her office on Wed. 11/10 her call-forwarding was off. She called Southwestern Bell that day & reported the problem and no-one from S.W.B. had called her back.

Today she called me and reported the problem to me. I suggested she call S.W.B. & report the problem again and get the technician's name and ask them to call her back with a ticket #.

She did call S.W.B. and spoke with Ray. Ray told her that the call-forwarding "can't just fall off." & also told her that in order for her to call-forward her phones, if in fact there was a problem, S.W.B. would have to visit their office and repair the problem. S.W.B. didn't come out to "repair" the problem and she was able to forward her phones later in the day.

Ray also told her that it could be a software problem @ Hastings that caused her call-forwarding to mal-function.

I told our client that I personally would call S.W.B. and clear up this misconception

A spoke w/ Jackie @ S.W.B. She asked me if there was foul weather Tues. 11/9 in the evening or early Wed. a.m. I told her I wasn't sure. She told me that it was foul outside and that could have caused the problem. Jackie informed me that there is a cable outside the office that could have come "unplugged". Jackie also told me that she's been with S.W.B. for 13 years and that she would call our client Jack and apologize. She also gave me a phone # where I could reach her or another op. directly.

@ About 2:30 p.m. Barbara @ S.W.B. called me. Barbara told me that if the call-forwarding had malfunctioned then the whole system would have mal-functioned. She said either our client didn't really forward correctly OR there is a problem @ Hastings! I told Barbara there is no problem here and we here knew that we could ~~not~~ have caused this problem. Barbara told me she had already called our client and explained this to her.

I called Cindy, our client, and asked her exactly what S.W.B. told her. Cindy was contacted by both Barbara and Jackie. Each woman gave her a different story. Cindy doesn't know what to believe.

Post-It® brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages: 1

TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF TEL
REPORT OF CLIENT LC
SOUTHWESTERN BELL CALL

To	MARK HASTINGS	From	ART FALLON
Co		Co	
Dept		Phone	(713) 468-4123
Fax	(512) 472 1558	Fax	

Make copies of this blank form. Complete copies as needed and mail or fax immediately.

This client was (circle one): LOST NEARLY LOST

Client or Company Name *:

Carol Finnett

(* see note at bottom)

Client's Address: 211 1/2 Jessamine City & ZIP: Houston TX 7700

Client's Phone: 868-9527 Disconnect Date: _____

Name of person requesting that service be stopped: _____

Please ask this person to be as specific as possible about how they (or whomever in their company) were solicited by SW Bell for CallNotes or Business Voice Mail.
Check one:

- ____ As a new client, they called SW Bell to order Call Forwarding and were solicited.
- ____ Client called SW Bell Repair to report trouble and were solicited.
- D Client called SW Bell to order their phones moved and were solicited.
- ____ Client called SW Bell to order an additional line and were solicited.
- ____ Client called SW Bell to ask about their bill and were solicited.
- ____ Client responded to SW Bell radio, TV or print advertising.
- ____ Client responded to SW Bell phone bill insert.
- ____ Client responded to SW Bell telemarketing (phone solicitation).
- ____ Other - Please explain in some detail:

Your Business Name: FALLON COMMUNICATIONS TATAS Member?: YES NO

Address: 8582 KATY FREEWAY 1220 HOUSTON Phone: (713) 468-4123

Person preparing this report: ART FALLON Date: 10-25-93

MAIL IMMEDIATELY TO: Mark Hastings, TATAS PUC Committee
825 West 11th, Austin TX 78701

OR FAX TO: 512-472-1558

*Note: If you nearly lost this client and were able to save them, you do not have to list their name. Instead you may list a code number or some other way you can identify them later if needed.

Post-It® brand fax transmittal memo / on / of pages / 1

To: <u>MARK HASTINGS</u>	From: <u>ART FALLON</u>
On: _____	Co: _____
Dept: _____	Phone: <u>713 468-4123</u>
Fax: <u>(512) 472-1558</u>	Fax: _____

PROSPECT UNHOOKED

TELEPHONE ANSWERING SERVICES
LOST (OR NEARLY LOST) TO
LLNOTES OR BUSINESS VOICE MAIL

Complete copies as needed and mail or fax immediately.

This client was (circle one): LOST NEARLY LOST

Client or Company Name*: TRAVIS MANAGEMENT

(* see note at bottom)

Client's Address: 8370 Westview City & ZIP: _____

Client's Phone: 782-8834 Disconnect Date: 11-23-93

Name of person requesting that service be stopped: PELLEY ROULEAU

Please ask this person to be as specific as possible about how they (or whomever in their company) were solicited by SW Bell for CallNotes or Business Voice Mail.

Check one:

- ☐ As a new client, they called SW Bell to order Call Forwarding and were solicited.
- ☐ Client called SW Bell Repair to report trouble and were solicited.
- ☒ Client called SW Bell to order their phones moved and were solicited.
- ☐ Client called SW Bell to order an additional line and were solicited.
- ☐ Client called SW Bell to ask about their bill and were solicited.
- ☐ Client responded to SW Bell radio, TV or print advertising.
- ☐ Client responded to SW Bell phone bill insert.
- ☐ Client responded to SW Bell telemarketing (phone solicitation).
- ☐ Other - Please explain in some detail:

Your Business Name: FALLON COMMUNICATIONS TATAS Member?: YES NO

Address: 8582 Katy Freeway Ste 220 Phone: (713) 468-4123

Person preparing this report: MTL Weinstein Date: 11/23/93

MAIL IMMEDIATELY TO: Mark Hastings, TATAS PUC Committee
825 West 11th, Austin TX 78701

OR FAX TO: 512-472-1558

*Note: If you nearly lost this client and were able to save them, you do not have to list their name. Instead you may list a code number or some other way you can identify them later if needed.



825 West Eleventh Street • Austin, Texas 78701-2086 • (512) 476-6358

September 24, 1993

Ms. Kae Berry
Area Manager-Central Operations Group
One Bell Plaza, Room 2702
Dallas TX 75201

Dear Ms. Berry

As our designated point of contact for Southwestern Bell Telephone for complaints or claims concerning disparaging remarks by SWBT customer service representatives regarding our service I must report the following incident:

On Friday August 8th, Theresa, one of our customer service people, called SWBT regarding a problem with the call forwarding for Bates Investigations-451-2375 (a client of ours). Mr. Bates had told us that he forwards his phone and when he comes in the next day the phone is not forwarded. Theresa spoke with Helen (Opr 825) at SWBT and before she knew who Theresa was, she told Theresa that if the phone was call forwarded to an answering service the problem was with the answering service. Helen said that the phones would not call forward unless our client forwarded twice. Theresa then identified herself and asked Helen to tell her what was wrong at our answering service. Helen told her she would check with the Central Office and call back. When Helen called back she said that the Central Office said "Some answering services don't have answer supervision and that's why our client has to call forward twice."

This is not the first time that an incident of this kind has occurred. If there is a problem with the way our equipment is interfacing with the network we would like to know about it. But it is not right for your representatives to generalize that all answering services must be having a problem. To slander our company with such a statement is wrong. According to the settlement agreement between SWBT and TATAS "SWBT will use its best efforts to follow and enforce...its customer service representatives guidelines". I ask that you look into this and let me know what will be done to prevent this from happening again the next time one of our clients calls SWBT.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mark Hastings".

Mark Hastings
President

cc: Telemessaging Services Association of Texas, PUC Committee



825 West Eleventh Street • Austin, Texas 78701 • 2086 • (512) 476-6358

July 30, 1993

Ms Kae Berry
Area Manager-Central Operations Group
One Bell Plaza, Room 2702
Dallas TX 75201

Dear Ms Berry

As our designated point of contact for Southwestern Bell Telephone for complaints or claims concerning Call Forwarding-Busy Line/Don't Answer I must report the following incident:

On Monday July 26 the husband of one of my employees, Mr. Delacruz, told me he called SWBT to have CFDA added to their phone, 512/326-8442. He told the SWBT representative that he wanted it to forward to our company's voice mail system. He says the rep asked him to what telephone number the CFDA should forward. He told the rep that it should forward to 482-6074 after 4 to 5 rings. Mr. Delacruz believes that it was forwarding to the correct number at that time. Later Mr. Delacruz called SWBT to reduce the number of rings to 3 to 4 rings. Mr. Delacruz some time later noticed that it was forwarding to SMSi CallNotes instead of to our voice mail system. Today his wife, our employee, called SWBT repair to correct the problem, but the repair personnel were unable to understand the problem. She was then referred to Kurt at 870-1557 with SWBT who was pleasant and said he would correct the problem within the hour.

The immediate problem has apparently been rectified. However I am concerned as to the proficiency of SWBT Service Center and repair personnel in understanding that Call Forwarding-Busy Line/Don't Answer is not a service of CallNotes but is a tariffed exchange service. I ask you to see that this is conveyed to the appropriate personnel in SWBT.

Sincerely,

Mark Hastings
President

cc: Telemessaging Services Association of Texas, PUC Committee



message center

May 19, 1993

Ms. Martha J. Lockwood
Executive Vice President
ATSI
1150 S. Washington Street
Suite 150
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Ms. Lockwood:

As per Mark Hastings's request, you will find detailed below our latest horror story involving Southwestern Bell. You will note that we are located in Plano, Texas (Dallas metroplex area).

Recently, I contacted Southwestern Bell for a customer that needed "Call Forwarding If no Answer" and "Call Forwarding Busy" to be directed to our Voice Mail System. The customer is being served by Metro Service. The moment Bell's representative, Derrick Brown, found this out, he explained very curtly to me that if my account was being served by Metro Service they would not provide enhanced services for them unless the customer utilized Bell's Voice Mail. After further discussion on the matter, the Bell rep concluded the conversation by saying, "our tariff states that we do not have to provide these services, and you are not going to get this business."

Within the hour, Jeannie Dickson, here at Tasco spoke with Mark Hastings and through Mark's efforts received a call from Mr. Lowell Feldman with the FOC. Mr. Feldman and I jointly called the same Bell rep back and spoke with him in detail about this matter. Mr. Feldman explained to the rep that his interpretation of the tariff was not the same as his. Mr. Feldman also told the Bell rep to fax to his office immediately his views on this tariff.

Shortly after Mr. Feldman and I concluded the call with Derrick Brown, I received a call from him saying that they at Southwestern Bell had changed their minds and would honor our request and provide enhanced services for our customer.

I might add that had Mr. Feldman not intervened, my company would have lost 20 accounts over this one incident.

If I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Richard Baker
Richard Baker

RB/jd



2825 Wilcrest
Suite 311
Houston, Texas 77042

(713) 763-0123

January 6, 1992

Mark Hastings
Hastings TAS
825 West Eleventh Street
Austin, Tx 78701

Dear Mark:

I have had two instances in the past three months that concern me and should concern our industry, as they relate to what I feel is unfair competition from Southwestern Bell Telephone.


The first instance occurred a couple of months ago where I was attempting to rent forty voice mailboxes to a company that had Centrex services. When I explained that they could use World Wide Transfer (a Centrex feature) to transfer outside callers to their respective mailboxes they were very excited. I suggested that they call SWBT to see if they already had the feature, or what that feature would cost them if they did not already have it. A few days later I was called into a meeting to justify my voice mail service against SWBT's, with the SWBT Rep sitting right there! How are we supposed to recommend services that only SWBT offers without exposing our prospects to their competitive voice mail services?

The next situation I thought I had learned a lesson. I familiarized myself with all aspects of Centrex, even offering to handle the ordering and coordination of the service for a prospective customer (without centrex and World Wide Transfer my voice mail services would loose 50% of it's benefit). Unbeknownst to me, this customer called SWBT to confirm some of the issues we discussed, and once again they were in the prospects office proposing their voice mail services.

It is not our station in life to prospect for SWBT. They do not pay us to recommend and coordinate the various services that our customers require to enhance our voice mail services, and they surely don't pay us to lead them into qualified prospects.

Anything you can do to help this situation?

Sincerely,


Ralph L. Hayes
Owner

ACETS Members

WARNING!

Monday morning the GTE telemarketing blitz began at Echo Communications. Using our CPNI, they began calling our hard-wired customers in one central office. Two customers called to inform us, then our operators received another call for a customer who was not in his office.

The telemarketers warned our customers that their rates would rise drastically on January 1 because they are on our answering service. The telemarketers told them what their current monthly rate is and how much it would be in January. The monthly cost for connection to the answering service would rise from \$2.50 to \$21.36. However, they could replace their answering service with GTE Personal Secretary for \$4.95 per month and no installation charge at this time.

Neither California nor Federal law prevents the monopolies from using CPNI in the competitive marketplace against us.

For Echo, the astronomic rate increase for secretarial lines led to a decision to convert customers to call-forwarding, especially at remote concentrator sites. The GTE installation charge for call-forwarding is being waived for the present. Customers were notified promptly that Echo would help them avoid the rate increase.


Several new features for call-forwarding are being developed and implemented, including busy/call-forward and no answer/call-forward.

Cheryl Akers, the answering service industry liaison for GTE (714/373-8127) has been very sympathetic, cooperative, and helpful.

COMMUNICATIONS

Attn: Martha Lockwood
Steve La Pierre

Sincerely,


Tom Parent

Memo to: Martha Lockwood ATSI

From: Cedric Adams

December 5, 1994

Hi Martha. I just returned from an IILC meeting in San Antonio. Sorry you were not able to attend.

I spoke to Mike Drew from GTE regarding the Tom Parent complaint.

He was hoping to speak with you. In the meantime, I asked him what happened and he wrote the following explanation.

We visited the issue. He assures me that it was no policy matter, rather an individual case of a service rep taking matters into her own hand.

He asked that you call him directly if you have any questions,

I am inclined to believe that GTE does not have any intentional policy to violate the spirit of CPNI usage. GTE has been in IILC as a volunteer for 3 years before they were required to participate.

I am just the messenger on this one. Mike seems to believe that the proper discipline has been taken and that it should not happen again. If it does, he surely wants to know and will reach high places if another violation takes place.

Mike Drew tel # is 214-718-5215. Fax #214-644-5722

MERRY CHRISTMAS

Summary of GTEC Outbound IRD Call Problem

May-June

Steven Beals? met with GTE personnel regarding his concern with increase in secretarial rates due to IRD. GTE committed to individualized support on this problem!

November

GTE California began outbound program from BSC group targeting all designed service customers, not just answering service customers. GTE to suggest that customer should contact their answering service to see if there is another alternative (possibly DID) instead of hard-wired solution. No involvement by HQ Personal Sec. Product M

11/16/94

One rep. did not follow procedures and told customers that if they put in GTE's Personal Secretary that they could save money. One of the calls made by this rep. happened to be the call that ECHO Communications picked up for their client. Also happened with another answering service.

11/22/94

Cheryl Abene has worked with personnel in Huntington Beach BSC. Have revised how GTE talks to customer to let them know that we are NOT to try to convert customer to Personal Secretary. Unfortunate incident with one rep. GTE is to only inform them of IRD rate increase due to (OVER)

works with California PUC!

Problem should not reoccur.



STATE OF TEXAS)
) ss
COUNTY OF DALLAS)

AFFIDAVIT OF PETER P. GUGGINA

Peter P. Guggina, being duly sworn and under oath deposes and states as follows:

1. I am employed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation as the Director of Technical Standards Management. My office address is 2400 N. Glenville Drive, Richardson, Texas 75082. In this capacity, I am responsible for managing a staff that plans, coordinates and executes MCI's participation in the industry forums and standards process. My position provides a daily view of the status and events that take place in these arenas. In addition to participating directly in and monitoring other MCI participants' progress, I am in constant contact with other industry participants in an attempt to resolve issues and to make the process more effective.

2. I am also my company's representative to the Board of Directors of the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions (ATIS),^{1/} formerly the Exchange Carrier Standards Association (ECSA), which sponsors many telecommunications standards setting bodies and industry forums. In addition, I

^{1/} ATIS's stated mission is to promote the timely resolution of national and international issues involving telecommunications standards and the development of operational guidelines.

am also MCI's representative to the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). I also serve as Vice-chair to the Carrier Liaison Committee (CLC),^{2/} which provides oversight management of the ATIS/CLC forums. Further, I am Chairman of the Interexchange Carrier Industry Committee ("ICIC"), an industry group that reviews technical subject matters associated with exchange access services. Chairing the ICIC provides me additional exposure to a cross section of industry activities related to the forum and standards process. My involvement with these industry activities began in 1984, and I have over 20 years of telecommunications operation, engineering, and network planning experience.

3. I am submitting this Affidavit in connection with the FCC's proceedings in Computer III Further Remand Proceedings: Bell Operating Company Provision of Enhanced Services, Docket No. 95-20.

4. Enhanced services markets will be strongly affected by the technical standards that define whether and how various public switched telephone network features and services are made available to enhanced service providers (ESPs). Quite simply, these standards, and the implementation thereof, will

^{2/} The CLC's stated mission is to provide interindustry mechanisms for the discussion and voluntary resolution of nationwide concerns regarding the provision of exchange access and telecommunications network interconnection. The CLC is an umbrella organization for the Ordering and Billing Forum (OBF), the Network Operations Forum (NOF) and the Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum (ICCF).

determine how and when ESPs can connect in a uniform manner with the telephone network and, therefore, can be of life or death business consequence for those firms.

5. These technical standards are not set by regulatory agencies. Rather, they are developed through industry forums and standards committees. The forums and committees consist of both the telephone companies and firms that want to connect to the telephone network. Of necessity, the Regional Bell Operating Companies ("RBOCs") are major players in these forums and committees. When the RBOCs participate in these bodies as both monopoly providers of network services and competing providers of enhanced services, they have the incentive and the ability to use their power to influence decisions and resolutions that will favor their own enhanced service operations over those of non-RBOC providers. These bodies develop voluntary standards and industry solutions to problems relating to network interconnection with local exchange carriers (LECs), interexchange carriers (IXCs), ESPs and equipment vendors. Generally, the standards committees develop uniform architectures, protocols and interfaces, and the forums develop technical and operational solutions to industry issues associated with the provision and implementation of exchange access.

6. In this Affidavit, I will discuss several ways in which the RBOCs and Bellcore control or delay the outcome of

issues worked under the ATIS structure.

I. The RBOCs and Bellcore Can Control Enhanced Services Development Through Dominance of the Industry Standards and Forum Process

7. The degree of access to RBOC unbundled services and network components will be determined by the willingness of the RBOCs to reach agreements at the industry forums and to implement those agreements. The forum which was thought to affect to a large degree how enhanced services will be delivered to the market is the Information Industry Liaison Committee (IILC).^{3/} The IILC is a committee under the sponsorship of ATIS. MCI, as a provider of enhanced services, and many ESPs have participated in IILC activities since its inception. However, the results of many years of effort have not yielded many tangible results. In fact, in the area of open access, unbundled network components are still not available. While the IILC has produced some high level unbundling documents, (e.g., Issue #026, Long Term Unbundling and Network Evolution) which have reached initial closure, there is no indication or assurance of when an unbundled network will be available, if ever. Issue #026, which has taken over four years of intensive discussion and work by a large task group of the IILC, is not a technical specification, but rather a high level study to examine the

^{3/}The Information Industry Liaison Committee serves as an interindustry mechanism for the discussion and voluntary resolution of industry-wide concerns about the provision of Open Network Architecture (ONA) services and related matters.

technical and operational problems and assess their scope and possible solutions. Hence, additional technical, operational, etc. specifications remain to be developed. In addition, a long list of public policy issues have been identified, some of which are not related to unbundling and appear to be nothing more than RBOC tactical hurdles to avoid taking action. This will further confuse resolution of the issues and prolong the true implementation of open access and network unbundling. In order to bring such unbundling scenarios into reality, the RBOCs would have to solve the associated problems and perform those actions necessary for implementation.

8. The serial nature of the industry forum, standards and Bellcore processes assures that RBOC networks will not be unbundled in the foreseeable future, even if positive agreements are reached along the way, unless a regulatory mandate is imposed for a date certain or an incentive is created. The IILC issue #026 document is being "sliced" into small pieces. If the piece parts are referred to standards committees and other industry forums to work on developing additional and related industry agreements, as the RBOCs have proposed, the industry forums and standards process can take many more years, and implementation may never become a reality. It is likely that the IILC's unbundled access points document will dissipate once it is sliced into small pieces and referred to other industry forums and standards committees.

9. In its March 1995 filing in Docket 95-20, GeoNet referred to flaws in the IILC process, based on their experience with IILC Issue #044. This issue involved access to the Local Exchange Advanced Intelligent Network (AIN) by a Non-LEC switching device. GeoNet cites problems with (1) IILC issue acceptance, (2) the voluntary nature of participation, which has led to very little input from RBOC participants and (3) issue resolution consensus. Further, GeoNet claims that these flaws will severely limit the effectiveness of the IILC in resolving uniformity issues relating to new technology. MCI shares GeoNet's concerns, and believes that the problem is not as much with the IILC as it is with the strategies and objectives of RBOC participants.

10. From my experience, this situation is not limited to the IILC. Issues originated by ESPs and presented to the forum are frequently altered by RBOC participants.^{4/} Hence, the scope and intent of the issues are changed in order to gain RBOC support in working the issue. So, when forum work begins, the issue under study may have little relevance to the issue originally brought to the Committee. This tactic can be used to make it more difficult to later seek regulatory or other forms of relief, since the original scope and intent are

^{4/} The industry forums utilize a formal process of issue introduction. Issue statements are utilized to define the problem to be solved. Also, the originator states a desired outcome.

not documented. So, time is wasted working on issues which do not meet the needs of the ESP originators, which results in delay.

11. MCI is supporting changes in the IILC process aimed at making the process more efficient, certain, and less costly. However, improving procedures alone will not correct the problems. To correct the problems, the RBOCs must proactively pursue solutions to ESPs needs, i.e. true unbundling. Typically, the RBOCs claim that progress is slowed because the ESPs have not submitted enough "technical contributions," i.e., technical papers. However, that excuse is a red herring to divert attention from the RBOCs' own inaction and unwillingness to provide solutions. The RBOCs need to listen to ESP needs and provide comprehensive contributions to resolve the issues.

12. Even if GeoNet succeeded in getting its issue accepted as it originally intended and subsequently resolved, this would not assure that the RBOCs would agree to implement the solution. If the RBOCs did agree, they could direct Bellcore to create or change the appropriate technical documents, e.g., Bellcore "Technical References" and "Generic Requirements". Such changes could be brought into standards committees, if and when needed, and given to vendors to

develop.^{5/}

13. The RBOCs use tactics of slicing issues into small pieces, forum shopping, changing the originator's issue statement and objective, dominating the consensus process, and prolonging discussion and studying issues instead of taking focused actions. And when they have exhausted their delay tactics, they simply do not implement agreements, as such agreements are voluntary.

14. In addition, in many cases, the resolutions of IILC issues contain language which specifies an investigation of a particular request rather than the implementation thereof. Such studies and investigations may be appropriate in some instances, but do not provide any certainty of delivery of unbundled interfaces.

15. A better approach, which would provide a level of certainty, would be to simply require the RBOCs to cooperate and expedite network unbundling. I cannot identify a technical

^{5/} There have been preliminary reports of a possible sale or spin-off of Bellcore by the RBOCs. As a practical matter, such a sale is not likely to have much of an impact on the processes described herein, since the RBOCs could still coordinate among themselves just as easily and would still exercise dominance over these processes through their own representatives in the relevant industry committees, forums and associations and through their enormous purchasing power. Moreover, the RBOCs would likely be Bellcore's most significant customers, thereby continuing their strong influence on Bellcore.

or operational reason that would prevent the RBOCs from carrying out fundamental unbundling by engaging Bellcore to write technical requirements to implement the IILC issues as well as broader unbundled interfaces based on a clear set of objectives and timelines. Without a clear requirement, however, the industry will be subjected to a costly and uncertain discussion and paper-creating activity instead of true unbundling.

II. The RBOCs Can Effectively Use the Forums and Standards Process to Stall Developments and Implementations That Are Not Part of Their Plans

16. ATIS in its former structure (ECSA) was 100% LEC. The LEC membership criteria restriction was lifted and non-LEC industry entities were given eligibility for membership. However, it is a numerical fact that the LECs' interests remain in control. The ATIS profile reveals that 92% of its member companies are LECs, the board of directors is 82% LEC, and the officers were appointed mainly from the LEC ranks.

17. Despite the ATIS motto of doing what is best for the industry rather than putting a corporate interest first, the fact is that the LEC predominance in the ATIS membership and board continues to strongly influence its undertakings. In addition to the board and officers, most of the key ATIS staff also have been hired from the LEC industry. A meeting was recently held between the ATIS board of directors and representatives of the Internet Society for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of both organizations. One of

the Internet representatives asked if ATIS was involved in lobbying on policy issues. Mr. Sczypczak, the ATIS Chairman, promptly replied, "No, we do that in USTA". Mr. Sczypczak apparently overlooked the fact that USTA is a LEC association and is heavily involved in lobbying for MFJ relief, among other contentious issues, and many of the minority ATIS members are opposed to MFJ relief until certain conditions are met. Hence, it has been my experience that while ATIS membership has been "opened", its thinking continues to be strongly influenced by its LEC roots. This is not to deny that much of its work is well intended and that its staff does in fact work very diligently towards solving the industry's problems. However, it cannot be overlooked that the RBOCs do in fact enjoy a dominant position in these industry activities and heavily participate in the management of ATIS, which significantly influences its direction.

18. The RBOCs, through their ability to dominate and control consensus, have been able to postpone the delivery of new service capabilities and thus prevent access purchasers from offering new features based on those new capabilities. For example, since 1987 the RBOCs have placed various hurdles in the standards process and in the industry forums to delay access customers interested in using additional Signaling System Number 7 (SS7) signaling capabilities. One such capability would enable a LEC to pass the Carrier Identification Code (CIC) to an IXC via SS7 in an originating

Feature Group D access configuration. Passing the CIC would allow IXCs, for example, to provision universal trunk groups, thus eliminating the need to segregate traffic to identify service or reseller traffic usage. In addition, passing the CIC would allow IXCs to perform CIC-based routing and develop new services that would use the CIC as a call processing or billing mechanism trigger.

19. MCI and other IXCs have been forced to overcome one obstacle after another in obtaining this capability. MCI requested a CIC delivery mechanism as far back as 1987, when commenting on Bellcore technical documentation concerning SS7 interconnection. At the Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum (ICCF), MCI and other IXCs supplied comments to Bellcore's interLATA SS7 interface specifications (what eventually became TR-TSV-000905 and now known as FR-NWT-000905). MCI's request was for the SS7 Transit Network Selection (TNS) parameter, which contained the CIC information, to be made available as an orderable option for domestic calls, in addition to the existing requirement for international calls. The RBOCs' response, however, was that the issue would need to be worked in T1^{6/} standards. Then, when MCI brought the issue to the standards body in 1988,^{7/} the RBOCs would only consider

^{6/} Committee T1 is an ANSI-accredited standards committee for the development and coordination of North American telecommunications standards.

^{7/} MCI made a formal request to the SS7 signaling working group, T1S1.3, via contribution T1S1.3/88-07521, that the TNS
(continued...)